

with us or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.

It seems to me reasonable that if there are murderers who Fidel Castro is hiding in Cuba, he could easily return them so they could be prosecuted in New Jersey or other States where they committed the terrible crimes. If Cuba is on the State Department list of terrorist nations, it seems reasonable they ought to be removed before we give them help. I rest my case.

I hope my colleagues will support the Torricelli-Smith amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent request, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I thank Senators SMITH, HELMS, ENSIGN, GRAHAM, and NELSON for being part of this effort.

The administration supports these amendments and opposes the provision in the bill. It would be shocking if the President of the United States did not support us. President Bush has made very clear, in this world, you are with us in the fight against terrorism or you are against us.

We are in the middle of a worldwide fight against terrorism and almost unbelievably in this Senate this bill contains a provision that the United States would allow private banks, guaranteed by the U.S. Government, to sell products to Fidel Castro's Cuba while the State Department has listed Cuba as harboring terrorists—not one terrorist group but four terrorist groups.

Further, it is amending the bill to say to Fidel Castro: If you want the privilege of our finance, get yourself off the terrorist list; if you want the privilege of our finance, return the 77 fugitives living in Cuba wanted for murder, hijacking, and terrorist activities.

I ask my colleagues to think about what we are doing, what kind of a message we are sending. We send troops halfway around the world to fight terrorists. But now on the floor of the Senate, before our troops even come home, we are authorizing the financing of exports to a country we have identified as harboring terrorists. It doesn't make sense. Of course, the President is opposed to it. Of course, we should be opposed to it. But it will be argued that we need this for business, that we need this to help our farmers. I don't believe there is a farmer in America who wants to make a buck selling products to people who harbor fugitives from justice. But even if they did, what kind of a business proposition is this?

Fidel Castro owes \$11 billion to financial institutions, he has not paid it back; \$20 billion to former Soviet Union; he hasn't paid it back. His current account deficit is \$700 million. He can't meet the bills. Even if you loaned him the money, he couldn't pay it back.

Don't let anybody tell you that in doing this we are not being a generous people. Fidel Castro can buy American food. He has to pay for it. The United States has given more food and medicine to Cuba in the last 10 years than any one nation has given to any other nation in modern history. He is getting donations. He can buy our food. We just should not finance it because he can't buy it back and he doesn't deserve it.

Consistency in America foreign policy; financing sales to a nation on our terrorist list, never.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, does anyone in the Senate Chamber think Fidel Castro has ever missed a meal because for 40 years we have said to family farmers in America: You can't sell food to Cuba? What meal has he missed? You know and I know this 40-year failed policy is a policy that takes a swing at Fidel Castro and it hits poor people, and sick people, and hungry people in Cuba. And it hurts American farmers here at home. We know that.

Let me ask the question about consistency. We hear these discussions about Cuba. Is there a sanction against private financing to send food to Communist China? No, there is not. Is there a prohibition against private financing to send food to Vietnam, which is a Communist country? No, there is not. Is there a prohibition against sending food to North Korea, a Communist country? No. Is there a prohibition of private financing to send food to Libya or Iran? The answer is no. No.

So we are told that somehow there needs to be a sanction, or a continued sanction for the past 40 years, to prohibit private financing to send food to Cuba. It is a foolish failed public policy, and everyone knows it.

How long does it take to understand that a policy doesn't work? Ten years? Twenty years? With Cuba, it has been 40 years.

American farmers are told they should pay the price for this foreign policy. What is the price? The price is your Canadian neighbors can sell food to Cuba. The French can sell, the English can sell, and all of the European countries can sell. It is just the United States farmers who are told: You can't sell food to Cuba.

That is a foolish public policy. It is time to stop it, this notion about a Communist country. This is the only country in the world which employs this policy, and it doesn't work.

As I said when I started, Fidel Castro has not missed a meal because of this policy. But hungry people, sick people, and poor people have been severely disadvantaged for a long while. That is not what this country ought to be doing in foreign policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I move to table the Smith amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 375 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Baucus	Daschle	Landrieu
Bayh	Dayton	Leahy
Biden	DeWine	Levin
Bingaman	Dodd	Lincoln
Bond	Dorgan	Lugar
Boxer	Durbin	Mikulski
Breaux	Edwards	Miller
Brownback	Enzi	Murray
Burns	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Campbell	Feinstein	Nickles
Cantwell	Fitzgerald	Reed
Carnahan	Grassley	Roberts
Carper	Hagel	Rockefeller
Chafee	Harkin	Sarbanes
Cleland	Hutchinson	Stabenow
Clinton	Inouye	Thomas
Cochran	Jeffords	Warner
Collins	Johnson	Wellstone
Conrad	Kennedy	Wyden
Craig	Kerry	
Crapo	Kohl	

NAYS—33

Allard	Hatch	Schumer
Allen	Hollings	Sessions
Bennett	Hutchison	Shelby
Bunning	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Kyl	Smith (OR)
Corzine	Lieberman	Snowe
Domenici	McCain	Specter
Ensign	McConnell	Stevens
Frist	Nelson (FL)	Thompson
Graham	Reid	Thurmond
Gregg	Santorum	Torricelli

NOT VOTING—6

Akaka	Helms	Murkowski
Gramm	Lott	Voinovich

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HARKIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to go back to the farm bill to offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER). Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PASSING A FARM BILL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I filed an amendment. I know I cannot call it up tonight. I hoped to be able to lay down this amendment this evening. At this point, I can't. But hopefully we will be able to work out a means by which I can lay that amendment down tomorrow morning before the cloture vote tomorrow afternoon.

The amendment I filed this evening is the bipartisan farm bill that had been filed earlier by Senator LINCOLN, myself, Senator HELMS, Senator MILLER, Senator SESSIONS, Senator Landrieu, and Senator BREAUX. It is truly the only bipartisan farm bill we have had out here, with four Democrats and three Republicans. It is basically the House bill that was passed by the House of Representatives.

At this late date, I have done everything I can to move a farm bill forward. I again reiterate my strong support for passing and completing a farm bill this year.

Farmers in the State of Arkansas have been very clear with me on this issue, just as I think they have been clear with most Members of the Senate. They want to see a farm bill completed before we leave for Christmas.

When the farm bill debate seemed to be dragging, I urged my colleagues to move forward. We introduced a bipartisan bill closely resembling that which was passed in the House in hopes that it would start the Agriculture Committee moving forward. I commend Senator HARKIN, the chairman, for pushing a markup late in this session. After all of the time and energy that was spent on a lot of issues impor-

tant to this country—the war on terror—Senator HARKIN was determined that we get the bill out of committee. I supported that. I supported the Cochran-Roberts proposal and turned around and supported the chairman's proposal. I thought we had to get something out this year. If it took compromise on my part, I was willing to make it.

I was not the only Republican member of the Agriculture Committee to support the Harkin commodity title. I don't think it is necessarily the best policy, but it is far better than what our farmers are dealing with right now.

When the farm bill came to the floor, I was assured that now was the time we would seek the final compromise to get this farm bill passed. However, the process has broken down along partisan lines. We have not been able to come to a consensus.

I am deeply disappointed that we are at risk of now leaving without a farm bill. I don't blame my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. I don't blame my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle. But it is time we achieve a compromise. We must not dig in our heels at this point.

I believe the House bill is the best possible chance we have of getting a bill to the President. Again, this bill is sponsored by four Democrats and three Republicans. It was one about which I talked with the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. It could be conferenced very quickly—in a matter of probably an hour's time—and we could have a bill to the President. While all of us may have our preferences, this is our chance to get something to the President this year.

I voted for cloture repeatedly, and I am going to continue to vote for cloture. I have crossed the lines to do so many times. Some have suggested where that line is right now.

I know my farmers want a farm bill. In an effort to move that process forward, I offered this bipartisan alternative. I filed it tonight. It is cosponsored by Senator LOTT and Senator SESSIONS. I am hopeful the cosponsors of the legislation when it was first introduced will join in support of this bill and that we will be able to get a bill signed into law.

Even if we were able to get cloture tomorrow and get it passed at this late date, there is no possible way the differences between the Harkin bill and the House-passed bill could be reconciled in time to help our farmers.

This past weekend I heard the farmers in Arkansas saying if we don't get it done before the new year, it is too late—in effect, that they are now going to their bankers and making the loans. They are making their preparations for crops next year. To wait until after we come back on January 23 before we put together a conference to begin to try to work out differences in the House and Senate bill is not good news for the farmers of this country. The best chance we have of getting this bill

signed into law this year is to adopt this House bill, the substitute, and send it to a quick conference, and on to the President for his signature.

I hope we will have the opportunity in the morning to get this laid down. Depending on the outcome of that cloture vote, we will have a full and thorough debate. An opportunity to vote on this substitute is really our last chance to get a bill signed into law before we leave for Christmas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, farm-related issues are very important to the people of Nevada. We raise cattle. We have dairies. We grow a lot of garlic. We have one place in the State of Nevada which raises the largest amount of white onions than any place in the United States. Even though it is not a great contributor to our economy, it is a very important contributor to our economy.

For someone who is not involved in the nitty-gritty of the farm bill, I know there is one section I worked on which is extremely important to the people of our country—especially the western part of the United States—dealing with conservation.

It is too bad there is a concerted effort to kill this legislation. This bill is extremely important to our country. Farm bills have been part of this country since we became a country. I hope that tomorrow when we vote again to invoke cloture, people will understand that it may be the last attempt to get a farm bill this year.

With all the plaintive cry, Well, I think we should pass the bill that the House passed some time ago—I am familiar, generally speaking, with the House bill. I am also familiar with what has happened in the Senate. I may not know every line and verse of the Senate bill, but I know, because I have been involved in putting together that bill procedurally, how difficult it has been to arrive at this point where there is general agreement. More than 50 Senators want this bill to pass. I will bet, if the truth were known, it would be a lot more than 50 Senators. People want this legislation to pass.

This is an effort maybe to try to embarrass Senators, I guess. There is no other reason I can think of. I have never said this publicly, but the fact of matter is the chairman of this committee is up for reelection this year. There is nothing more important to the majority leader's State than farm issues. Maybe it is an attempt to embarrass the majority leader.

I could go on with reasons for attempting to kill this bill. But the fact of the matter is the only people being hurt—this is not about Democrats and Republicans being hurt in this stalling procedure—are the people of this country who need this bill. This bill is important to more than agricultural producers in this country. It is important to people who consume these agricultural products.